

REMARKS

Claims 1-56 are all the claims pending in the application. Applicant submits that the modifications to independent claims 1, 23, 47, 53 and 55 are supported at least in Figs. 3 and 8 and the corresponding descriptions in the Specification (e.g., pages 30-31), and the modifications to independent claims 12, 35, 50, 54 and 56 are supported at least in Fig. 18 and the corresponding descriptions in the Specification (e.g., page 40). No new matter has been added.

I. Formalities

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for foreign priority and for confirming receipt of the certified copy of the priority document

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating the Formal Drawings filed on July 3, 2001 have been accepted.

II. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-7, 9, 11-18, 22-30, 32, 34-42, 44 and 46-56 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Goldberg (US 6,526,158) [“Goldberg”]. For at least the following reasons, Applicant traverses the rejection.

Claim 1, as amended, recites an image collecting system that comprises “a character positioning unit for obtaining position information representing a physical area in which the target character exists at a certain time among a plurality of areas.” (emphasis added). The Examiner contends that Goldberg discloses this feature.

Goldberg discloses the following:

In step 139, the remote ID identification tag 49 comes into range of the remote ID reader 52. In step 141, the tag 49 sending its identifying

signal to the remote ID reader 52. The system now has information about the identity of the patron 43, as well as the patron's approximate location in the ride, due to the generally short transmission distance of the tag 49. Because the system also has knowledge about the locations of each car 45 in a ride, the system can now identify the patrons 43 to a particular car 45 in specific captured images.

In step 143, the car 45 carrying the patron 43 passes a switch (comprised in this case of the infrared transmission device 55, its infrared light beam 59, and the infrared receiver 57) and which actuates the camera 63. Because the switch indicates the instantaneous position of individual cars 45, and the location of patrons 43 in different cars 45 is known, then the identity of a particular patron 43 within the photographic image can be inferred.

Col. 7, lines 40-58.

Applicant submits that, even if, for the sake of argument alone, Goldberg mentions the location of the patrons, it is in relation to cars in an amusement ride. Goldberg is silent of the claimed character positioning unit for obtaining position information representing a physical location.

Because independent claims 23, 47, 53 and 55 recite features similar to those given above with respect to claim 1, Applicant submits that these claims are patentable for at least a reason similar to that given above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 12, as amended, recites an image screening system that comprises “an image screening unit for identifying an area in which said camera system captures said image for the target character according to said time and said position information obtained by said character positioning unit, screening images captured in other areas out of a plurality of images to obtain remaining images and selecting said image having said target character from said remaining images according to said character information.”

Applicant submits that Goldberg is silent of the features of the claimed image screening unit as set forth in claim 12.

Because independent claims 35, 50, 54 and 56 recite features similar to those given above with respect to claim 12, Applicant submits that these claims are patentable for at least a reason similar to that given above with respect to claim 12.

Applicant submits that the remaining claims are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies.

III. Claim Objections

The Office Action Summary Sheet indicates that claims 8, 10, 19-21, 31, 33, 43 and 45 are objected to, but the body of the Office Action does not provide any details with respect to the substance of the objection.

Applicant is assuming that these claims contain allowable subject matter. Applicant requests that the Examiner provide details in the next Office Action with respect to these claims. In the event that these claims do not contain allowable subject matter, Applicant requests that next Office Action be on a Non-Final basis.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Serial No. 09/897,603

Attorney Docket No.: Q65248

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER



Bhaskar Kakarla
Registration No. 54,627

Date: December 29, 2004